Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 463 Case file # 95-277908.

Material Examiner: Malone (RQ)

Remarks:

Case resulted in guilty plea, no transcript.

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 10:30 AM (Time), 11/05/01 (Date)

File #: 95-277908

Laboratory #(s): 70423028
70528004

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X	☐		☐	☐
QW	☐	X		☐	☐
	☐	☐		☐	☐

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: Not available

Testimony Date(s): Pages:

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 70423028/70528004 Date: Sept. 10, 1987

Laboratory Number: Date:

Laboratory Number: Date:

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ and unknown technician

Laboratory Number:

Initials:

CRM - 3789

Was any other material reviewed? X Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: submitting agency letter dated 4-17-87

Results of Review

File #: 95-277908 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q5, Q10-Q11, K1-K2, K5

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available **at the time of the original examination(s)**?
☐ Yes ☐ No X☐ Unable to Determine

2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes? ☐ Yes X☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

XX☐ Transcript not available.

3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Initials: SLH

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-277908

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, one cannot determine from the notes that the examination was conducted in an appropriate manner.

#2: Documentation is poor. The notes are not dated, are in pencil and not ink and abbreviations are used that are difficult to interpret. The technician's notes do not document the recovery of hair from the Q items. Some of the recovered hair are marked "NSFC" (presumably Not Suitable For Comparison) with no documented reason why they are not suitable.

It appears that a second qualified (?) hair examiner verified the hair comparison stated in the lab report.

Review completed at: 11:00 AM (Time), 11/05/01 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.50 hr.

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Lehrer — 11/05/2001

(Signature) (Date)

Initials: SNL